HIP-2007-09/TH
hep-ph/0702236

arXiv:hep-ph/0702236v1 22 Feb 2007

The Matrix Reloaded - on the Dark Energy Seesaw

Kari Enqvist[1*] Steen Hannestad[2†] Martin S. Sloth[2‡]

[1] *Helsinki Institute of Physics, P.O. Box 64,*
FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

[2] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Aarhus*
DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

Abstract

We propose a novel mechanism for dark energy, based on an extended seesaw for scalar fields, which does not require any new physics at energies below the TeV scale. A very light quintessence mass is usually considered to be technically unnatural, unless it is protected by some symmetry broken at the new very light scale. We propose that one can use an extended seesaw mechanism to construct technically natural models for very light fields, protected by SUSY softly broken above a TeV.

*enqvist@helsinki.fi
†sth@phys.au.dk
‡sloth@phys.au.dk

The evidence for the recent acceleration in the expansion rate of the Universe is compelling. The effect has been probed directly using distant type Ia supernovae [1, 2], the most recent data coming from the ESSENCE and SuperNova Legacy Survey (SNLS) projects [3, 4]. The finding is confirmed by precision measurements of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) by the WMAP satellite [5], as well as measurements of the large scale structure (LSS) from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey [6].

This host of different observations all point to a cosmology in which space-time is flat and the energy density dominated by a dark energy component with an equation of state close to -1. Since $\rho_{\rm DE} \sim H^2 \sim (10^{-3}\,{\rm eV})^2$ at present, the dark energy phenomenon is naturally associated with an energy scale of order 10^{-3} eV, much lower than any known scale in particle physics.

The simplest way of introducing dark energy with the correct properties is to introduce a very small cosmological constant by hand, without addressing the origin of this small scale. This is unsatisfactory, and thus we would like to construct physically well motivated models where the new small mass scale emerges from a deeper principle that also leads to testable predictions for observable quantities such as the equation of state of dark energy.

One such model is the quintessence model [7, 8, 9, 10] where dark energy is driven by the slow-roll of a very light quintessence field. The effective mass has to be less than the inverse Hubble scale today, i.e. $m_{eff} \lesssim H^{-1} \sim 10^{-42}$ GeV for this model to work. Such a small mass cannot be protected from radiative corrections unless some additional symmetry is invoked. In the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), masses are protected by supersymmetry (SUSY) softly broken at the TeV scale. This implies that the fields generally gets radiative mass corrections of the order a TeV.

Compared to this the quintessence mass is incredibly small and even if added by hand, it will not be stable against radiative corrections. In neutrino physics a similar problem arises because of the hierarchy between the known neutrino masses $m_\nu \sim$ eV, and the TeV scale of the Higgs VEV. However, the seesaw mechanism [11, 12, 13, 14, 15] attempts to explain this by introducing a new set of right-handed neutrinos with Majorana masses of order $M_{\rm GUT}$. In that case the combined neutrino mass matrix can be diagonalised to contain two sets of Majorana masses of order $m \sim v^2/M$ and M for the left- and right-handed components respectively, where $v \sim 1$ TeV. This yields $m_{\nu_L} \sim$ eV, the smallest non-vanishing mass we would naively expect to be radiative stable, when couplings to known particles in the standard model are taken into account.

In the case of scalar fields one can introduce a new shift symmetry which requires the mass to vanish identically. By breaking the shift symmetry explicitly by a small parameter, μ, one can obtain a radiatively stable small effective mass. To obtain dark energy of the right magnitude, one needs $\mu \approx 10^{-3}$eV. In the pseudo Nambu-Goldstone Boson (pNGB) model [16] there is no explanation of where this scale is emerging from. In the case of the Peccei-Quinn axion, an effective $\mu \approx \Lambda_{QCD}$ is generated by QCD instanton effects, and in order to explain the origin of the low symmetry breaking scale $\mu \approx 10^{-3}$eV, in ref. [17] it was proposed that the pNGB quintessence mass μ could have a similar dynamical origin. However, the protection of such a small scale would require symmetry

breaking that takes place in a hidden sector.

Here we will consider an alternative possibility. The light neutrino mass eigenvalue in the usual neutrino seesaw mechanism is of order v^2/M. However, as we show below, there exist extended mass matrices of higher dimensions where the smallest mass eigenvalues are $v(v/M)^n$ with $n \geq 0$ is an integer. Moreover, we present explicit mass matrices of higher dimensions where all the entries in the diagonal are non-zero and of order M^2, but which nevertheless yield eigenvalues of the type $v(v/M)^n$. This has applications to scalar field models, where the diagonal elements are naturally of order M and the off-diagonal entries can be generated by soft SUSY breaking terms of order v or larger. Requiring that the resulting light mass is the quintessence mass implies that, in the case of $n = 5$, the heavy mass scale of the scalars coincides roughly with the required mass scale in the simplest scenario of chaotic inflation, $M \sim 10^{13}$ GeV. This adds the intriguing possibility that the heavy fields can also have been responsible for inflation in the early universe.

In the present paper we present one particular example of a configuration of 8 complex scalar fields which by virtue of the extended seesaw mechanism has a composite flat direction with properties adequate for quintessence. We also discuss the possible physical origin of such a mass matrix and construct one specific example, where the seesaw scalar mass matrix arises from a particular configuration of 5-, 6-, and 7-branes embedded in a 10D space-time.

The conventional two-neutrino seesaw model involves a mass matrix with one vanishing element in the diagonal. This is naturally achieved for fermions since chiral symmetry prevents them from acquiring a mass. However, the masses of scalar fields are not in general protected by a similar symmetry, and we expect scalar fields to acquire masses at least of order v^2. If we desire to construct a seesaw mechanism for scalar fields, this implies that we need to go to mass matrices of higher dimension.

First we observe that with a sufficiently large mass matrix with entries m, M where $m << M$, we can possibly have a mass eigenvalue m^5/M^4. In this case we can take $m \approx v$ and $M = M_{GUT}$ in order to obtain the desired quintessence mass scale. In this case a theory of the form

$$V(\phi) = \sum_{ij} m_{ij}^2 \phi_i \phi_j \ , \tag{1}$$

with all entries $m_{ij} \gtrsim v$ protected by supersymmetry, would suffice. Naively, such a mass matrix would give us a lightest mass of the expected size m^2/M, but for certain configurations the lightest mass eigenvalue is m^5/M^4, which would then be a radiatively stable quintessence mass.

Naively, this is not easy to realise in a realistic SUSY model. If the mass of the effective quintessence field is of the order of the inverse Hubble scale today $m_q \approx H_0$, then the vev of the quintessence field must be Planck scale $\langle q \rangle \approx M_{Pl}$. This implies that we also need to assume that self-couplings induced by marginal and irrelevant operators are absent in order to obtain a right energy density.

The next question is thus how to generate mass terms and mixings without generating marginal self-coupling operators. Consider for simplicity a superpotential of chiral superfields, which are singlets under the SM charges, given by

$$W = \sum M\Phi_i\Phi_j \ . \tag{2}$$

This induces a scalar potential for the scalar components ϕ_i of the superfields Φ_i with supersymmetric mass terms of the type $|dW/d\phi|^2$. In addition, there are soft SUSY breaking terms, which we assume to have the form $(m^2)^i{}_j\phi_i\phi^{*j}$, thus effectively neglecting the contribution from the A-term $\sim \mathrm{Re}(A_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j)$ for simplicity (recall that in e.g. no-scale supergravity $A_{ij} = 0$). Thus, the scalar potential would have the generic form

$$V = \sum_{ij}\left[M^2|\phi_i|^2 + M^2|\phi_j|^2 + (m^2)^i{}_j\phi_i\phi^{*j}\right] \tag{3}$$

In this model there are N complex scalar fields of mass M. In order to generate a configuration with an m^5/M^4 flat direction, we need $N \geq 7$. However, in order to sufficiently decouple the flat direction, it is necessary to go to $N = 8$, as we will see below.

Consider a model with 8 complex fields fields, which have masses set by some heavy scale near the GUT scale $M \approx M_{GUT}$. Then, if we assume that a symmetry breaking mechanism at the GUT scale induce bilinear mixings for some of the scalars at scale M and also that soft SUSY breaking bilinear mixing terms are induced at the weak scale $m \approx v$, we can obtain a mass matrix of the form

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M^2 & m^2 & 0 & M^2 & 0 & m^2 & m^2 & m^2 \\ m^2 & M^2 & 0 & m^2 & m^2 & m^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M^2 & 0 & M^2 & m^2 & 0 & 0 \\ M^2 & m^2 & 0 & M^2 & M^2 & M^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m^2 & M^2 & M^2 & M^2 & M^2 & 0 & m^2 \\ m^2 & m^2 & m^2 & M^2 & M^2 & M^2 & 0 & m^2 \\ m^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & M^2 & M^2 \\ m^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & m^2 & m^2 & M^2 & M^2 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4}$$

Some of the off-diagonal elements have here been chosen to vanish. This is necessary in order to obtain a mass eigenvalue of the order $m_{flat} \approx m^5/M^4$ and thus an effectively light scalar that can act as quintessence. We have arrived at the form Eq. (4) by numerical inspection, and will discuss the physical origin of the zeros shortly. However, let us first note that the mass matrix Eq. (4) may be diagonalised by the matrix P, such that $\mathcal{M}_d = P^{-1}\mathcal{M}P$. For Eq. (4) we find numerically the eigenvalues as

$$\mathcal{M}_d^2 = diag.(a_1M^2, a_2M^2, a_3M^2, a_4M^2, a_5M^2, -a_6M^2, -a_7M^2, a_8(m^5/M^4)^2) \ , \tag{5}$$

where the numerical coefficients $a_1, \ldots, a_8$ are positive and of order one.

As can be seen from Eq. (5), there are two negative eigenvalues which give rise to tachyonic instabilities unless we stabilise them with further interactions. We could try to add Yukawa's in the tachyonic directions, but this will in general shift the vacuum of the fields away from zero and lift the mass of the light field. So we need to be more careful. If the interaction eigenstates are $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_8$ and the mass eigenstates are $\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_8$, then the mass squared eigenvalue of the mass eigenvector χ_8 is order $(m^5/M^4)^2$. We can write

$$\chi_8 = \sum_{i=1}^{8} r_i \phi_i \ . \tag{6}$$

In the example of the 8×8 matrix above, it turns out that $r_2 \approx (m^7/M^7)^2$, which implies that the light direction has a very suppressed contribution from ϕ_2. Using the matrix P^{-1} we can invert this linear system and find $\phi_2 = t_1\chi_1 + \ldots + t_8\chi_n$ with $t_8 \approx r_2 \approx (m^7/M^7)^2$. Thus, if we lift the potential by a term $\lambda M^4(\phi_2/M)^n$, it will remain flat in the χ_8 direction.

Thus we are led to adding to the potential a non-renormalisable contribution

$$\lambda M^4 \left(\frac{\phi_2}{M}\right)^n = \lambda M^4 \left(t_1 \frac{\chi_1}{M} + \ldots + t_8 \frac{\chi_8}{M}\right)^n \ . \tag{7}$$

Now, due to the negative mass eigenstates, we assume that all fields acquire a true vacuum expectation value of order M. The vacuum energy in the new true vacuum is order $\lambda^{-1/(n-2)} M^4$. We assume that by renormalisation we can subtract the true vaccum energy of the theory. The only non-zero contribution left is from the flat direction, which is displaced from its true vacuum. The dominant contribution to the potential of the flat χ_8 direction is given by

$$V(\chi_8) \approx a_8 \left(\frac{m^5}{M^4}\right)^2 \chi_8^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{7} \lambda M^4 t_i^{n-1} t_8 \frac{\chi_8}{M} \left(\frac{\chi_i}{M}\right)^{n-1} \ . \tag{8}$$

Thus, we require $t_8 \ll (m^5/M^5)^2$ in order to suppress the contribution from the Yukawas. In the example above we found $t_8 \sim \mathcal{O}((m^7/M^7)^2)$ and the dominant contribution to the χ_8 potential is from the very light mass term – light enough to sustain quintessence.

We have found that in models with 7 scalar fields it is impossible to achieve mixings smaller than $(m^3/M^3)^2$ which is insufficient to maintain the lightness of the flat direction. Therefore a model with 8 complex scalar fields appears to be the simplest possible configuration in which the smallness of the quintessence mass can be protected against the Yukawa coupling used to cure the tachyonic instability. In models with 8 fields, our particular configuration Eq. (4) is not unique but there are also other possibilities for having $m_{\rm flat} \sim m^5/M^4$ and $r \sim (m^7/M^7)^2$.

Given the extreme smallness of the mass along the flat direction and its very small mixing one might worry about the stability against small corrections to individual elements in the matrix. In order to understand the stability of the small eigenvalues and

mixings, it is useful to note that when the soft mass is taken to zero, $m \to 0$, three discrete $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetries are restored:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Sym. 1} \;:\; \phi_2 \to -\phi_2 \\
&\text{Sym. 2} \;:\; \phi_7 \to -\phi_7 \;,\;\; \phi_8 \to -\phi_8 \\
&\text{Sym. 3} \;:\; \phi_1 \to -\phi_1 \;,\;\; \phi_3 \to -\phi_3 \;,\;\; \phi_4 \to -\phi_4 \;,\;\; \phi_5 \to -\phi_5 \;,\;\; \phi_6 \to -\phi_6 \;,
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

This implies that all the M values can be perturbed by a factor $\mathcal{O}(1)$, as long as they are identical within each of the sub-blocks defined by the symmetries. Furthermore, all the m values along rows or columns within a sub-block can be perturbed by a factor of order unity without destabilising the hierarchy. For example, all the M elements along rows or columns 13456 can be changed by a factor of order unity without changing the structure of the eigensystem.

Since a non-zero value for m breaks all discrete symmetries of the mass matrix, we may worry wether it is possible to prevent the zero entries in the mass matrix from obtaining values of order m. It is beyond the scope of this paper to construct a fundamental model that gives rise to the mass matrix Eq. (4), but as an example of how a mass matrix with the desired properties might emerge in an effective theory, let us consider the following scenario that makes use of branes in extra dimensions.

Suppose that each of the complex scalar fields are each quasi-localised on each their respective branes, with wave functions in the extra dimensions proportional to $\exp(-|y - y_i|M)$, where y_i denotes the location of the brane. If the complex scalars carry the same charge, Q, under a global $U(1)$ symmetry $\phi_i \to \exp(iQ\alpha)\phi_i$, then when all the branes are on top of each other, this allows for bilinear mixing terms of the type $(m^2)^i_j \phi_i \phi^{*j}$. However, if the branes are geographically separated in the extra dimensions, the overlap of the corresponding scalar fields' wavefunctions is exponentially suppressed. This implies that, when the extra dimension is integrated out, the bilinear interactions of the effective theory are exponentially suppressed and became of the form $(m^2)^i_j \exp(-Mr)\phi_i \phi^{*j}$, where r denotes the brane separation distance. From the point of view of the four dimensional low energy effective theory, when the branes are separated it appears as if there are eight distinct $U(1)$ symmetries, and the flavor violating interactions that breaks the $U(1) \otimes U(1) \otimes \ldots \otimes U(1)$ are exponentially suppressed, while there is no exponential suppression if the corresponding branes are on top of each other [18].

If we assume that all the elements $(m^2)^i_j$ are given by the scale M, the suppression of the bilinear interaction terms is given by $M^2 \exp(-Mr)$. With $M \approx M_{GUT}$, the branes can be taken to lie on top of each other in the directions where bilinear elements in the mass matrix of scale M are induced, while the branes are separated by $r \approx 60/M$ in the directions where bilinear elements at the soft scale $m \approx v$ are induced. In the directions where there are zeros in the off-diagonal, the branes are separated by a distance $r \gg 262/M$. If we assume that there are three brane fixed points, A, B and C, in each dimension, with A and B separated by $r \approx 60/M$ and C further away separated at a distance $r \gg 262/M$, this leads to the brane configuration for eight branes in six extra

dimensions shown in table 1. For instance, in dimension one we will have Brane 1 and Brane 4 localised on top of each other at fix point A while Brane 2, 7 and 8 are localised on top of each other at the fixed point B. Brane 3 is localised at the fixed point C in this direction. The remaining branes are not localised in this direction.

	Brane 1	Brane 2	Brane 3	Brane 4	Brane 5	Brane 6	Brane 7	Brane 8
Dim. 1	A	B	C	A			B	B
Dim. 2	A				C		A	
Dim. 3	A	A	A			B		A
Dim. 4		A			B	B	C	
Dim. 5					A	A		B
Dim. 6		A	A	A			C	C

Table 1: Brane configuration

To summarise, we have constructed an extended quintessence mass seesaw (EQMS) mechanism for a radiatively stable quintessence mass. A novelty in this model is that it only involves new physics at the TeV scale and the GUT scale, and the light quintessence mass is protected by SUSY softly broken above the TeV scale.

We also note that our configuration holds the potential for providing inflation during SUSY breaking at the M scale. We have available 8 potentials of the type $M^2\phi^2$, for which $M \sim 10^{13} - 10^{14}$ GeV, exactly the range needed for $m^2\phi^2$ chaotic inflation [19, 20]. The requirement is just that the true vacuum of the system is shifted to $\langle\phi\rangle = M$ instead of 0, so that the fields slowly roll towards this value.

As an interesting curiosity, one may note that an eight-by-eight matrix is the smallest which can provide the particular features that we require of the quintessence seesaw mass matrix, yielding small enough eigenvalues and mixings. However, to realise such a matrix with the type of brane configurations discussed in the previous section, we must require exactly six extra dimensions, which is also the generic prediction of string theory.

Acknowledgments

KE is partially supported by the Ehrnrooth Foundation and the Academy of Finland grant 114419

References

[1] S. Perlmutter et al., Astrophys. J, **517**, 565 (1999)

[2] A. G. Riess, et al. Astron. J,**116**, 1009, (1998)

[3] P. Astier, P. et al, Astron. and Astrophys. **447**, 31, (2006)

[4] W. M. Wood-Vasey *et al.*, arXiv:astro-ph/0701041.

[5] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, arXiv:astro-ph/0603449.

[6] M. Tegmark *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 123507 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0608632].

[7] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **302**, 668 (1988).

[8] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Astrophys. J. **325**, L17 (1988).

[9] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 3406 (1988).

[10] I. Zlatev, L. M. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 896 (1999) [arXiv:astro-ph/9807002].

[11] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 421 (1977).

[12] T. Yanagida, *Horizontal gauge symmetry and masses of neutrinos*, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on The Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe* (O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto, eds.), KEK, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979, p. 95.

[13] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, *Complex spinors and unified theories*, in *Supergravity* (P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman, eds.), North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979, p. 315.

[14] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).

[15] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2227 (1980).

[16] J. A. Frieman, C. T. Hill, A. Stebbins and I. Waga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2077 (1995) [arXiv:astro-ph/9505060].

[17] L. J. Hall, Y. Nomura and S. J. Oliver, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 141302 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0503706].

[18] G. R. Dvali and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Lett. B **460**, 47 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9904221].

[19] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **129**, 177 (1983).

[20] D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, Phys. Rept. **314**, 1 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9807278].